

Mr. Blacklow's Reply to Dr. Layburn's Pamphlet against him.

SIR,

I Return to you with a second part of the same Tune, a Pamphlet of Dr. *Layburn's*, against Mr. *Blacklow* and his Reply. Having gotten a Copy of it, I carried it to Mr. *Blacklow*, who, as soon as I had told him what it was, lamented himself, saying to me; You know my endeavour: have ever been to make a clearness and show a rationality, both in Faith and Divinity, as St. *Peter* commands us to be ready to do; and, must I now, when mine Ague gives me small, or no leisure, be employ'd in retorting the Pot-gun-shot of this Dr. Well, since it is God's disposition, read what you bring. But, I profess (my conscience being witness to my words) that were it not that through ambition he seeks to ruine the Clergy, hoping by such indirect and unhand-some means to make them stoop to accept him for their Superiour, all his calumnies against my person should not make me open my mouth to answer them. But this hath been our long quarrel that I have resisted his ambition, and for this he seeks other pretences against me.

This being said, he held his peace, and I began to read; nor had I read six lines, but Mr. *Blacklow* exclaimed. Jesus! what information hath this Dr. Or, what insolence is it to publish so patent an untruth against seven, or eight of your chief men about *London* upon pure gheesse? For, order to communicate my answer was neither granted nor asked; but the hint which occasioned me to do so was taken out of his Letter, in which he ordered that the said Letter should be sent to all your Brethren. Nor was my answer kept from him by me, but two Copies given by my self to a friend of his, to the end to have them sent to him; if his friend had not so much friendship for him as to send it, it was not my fault.

Then I read some two leaves without farther reflexion than that Mr. *Blacklow* noted that they were spent in the commendation of his own patience, the effects of which he

desired to see in his actions, saying that till that was done, words were but wind. Besides, the good Dr. took *Pilate* for *Christ* in citing those words, *non es amicus Caesaris*, as a reproach against our Saviour, which were spoken to *Pilate*, as every Childe knows: so that, according to this learned mistake, he calls *Pilate* here (p. 5.) *his Divine master*, and very sadly and soberly tells us, *he will strive to imitate him in his injurious reproaches*.

Being come to the 8th. page, the first objection presented it self, which was that Mr. Bl. had approved divers scandalous opinions, and would not recal his fact for the intreaties, or reasons which were brought him. Mr. Bl. reply'd, that the story passed thus. One of the learnedst and graveest Regulars of the Kingdom had written a book which clash't with another, written by a Cosen of the Drs. and the Dr. thought by his friendship to make Mr. Bl. recal his subscription for his Cosen's credit; and, not being able to do it, revenged himself by this groundlesse aspersion: For the book hath been justified both in *England* and beyond Seas, nay, in *Rome* it self. Wherefore the Dr. hath little reason to offend the party, and all his order, which maintains it, by attributing to it divers scandalous opinions, which is a notorious calumny.

I read farther how my Lord had commanded him to suppress Mr. Bl. his new Divinity. To which Mr. Bl. answered that this depended upon the proof. For my Lord in his Letter to him which is yet in his hands (dated June 22.) hath these words. *I have been so far from commanding Mr. Laybourn to cry against your book, I desired him to suppress all speech against it, as I assure you is true, and, I hope he will not deny.* And in his Letter of the 6th. of July, these: *what apparent ground you had to write that I had commanded Mr. Layburn to cry against your books was no true ground, seeing I commanded him the contrary.* And afterwards in the Letter; *Divers Saints and Learned men have (salvâ charitate) dissented in their opinions even in matters of Divinity, and so may you and I do, if we will: and God willing, it shall be so on my part.* When he had read me these words, He added; you may by this see how true his pretence was of impugning me in obedience to my Lord's commands, and whether my Lord moved him, or he my Lord.

Lord. And I remember to have heard, that when a friend objected this order of my Lord's to him, he answered *my Lord is a weak man*. By these passages also in his Letters is seen clearly that my Lord judged my *Tenets* to be onely different opinions in Divinity, not meriting such zealous impugnation, which the defining Doctor, like a new Law-giver to all Christians, so confidently pronounces to be Heresies; and makes that calumny of his own, a seeming pretence for his zeal, but in reality a Cloak for his too apparent malice.

I read farther, how for executing this command of my Lords *Mr. Bl.* was so incensed against him, that he cry'd him down in divers companies, and the ordinary character he gave him was, that he was an illiterate man not able to say *Bo* to a Goose. *Mr. Bl.* reply'd that the Doctor cared not how unlikely his tales were, so he said somewhat that might passe amongst those, who knew no more of the businesse than they found in his paper; For all that know *Mr. Bl.* know, that he is so far from haunting either good tables, or great companies, that he can be drawn to neither; and besides, he is very sparing in his speeches of the Doctor by reason of the place he holds; and rather ready to defend him against the many blames those who come from his house, lay upon him; unlesse it be to those to whom it belongs to see them amended. As it happen'd in the Character he speaks of, which he wrote to his Superiour, and does not think that he used it in any other occasion.

I read further how he had written *Mr. Bl.* a civil Letter, and put two places of *St. Austin* in it, and concluded that, that spirit was not from God, which was opposite to *St. Austin's* spirit; but that his good advice produced little fruit in *Mr. Bl.* *Mr. Bl.* answered that the Doctor took care he should not profit by it, nor be troubled with answering it; for whether perhaps he writ such a Letter, or no, to show up and down amongst his friends, to let them see how gravely he could advise, and how learnedly transcribe two places out of *St. Austin*, (for which he seems here to prize himself so much) yet *Mr. Bl.* affirms that the Letter was never sent to him, and that he should have shew'd how those places of *St. Austin*

came to his purpose as well as have merely transcribed them, and then have left the application of them, (that is, all they were brought for) to his own supposal. But most of all he wonder'd that the Doctor living amongst Catholicks should think there is but one particular Spirit in the Church. Is St. *Hierome* of the same Spirit with St. *Aufin* or did he not use another way against those, who opposed him irrationally than St. *Aufin* did? Doth not every Regular order pretend a several Spirit under the common Spirit of God? How carelesse then, and over-seeing is this Doctor in his Discourses?

I proceeded and read the Doctors words, how he was forced in a manner out of England, to engage in the Government of the Colledge affairs, and how not long after an Army of accusations was forged against him, and presented to the Nuncio at Paris, and from him remitted to Brussels, and he after mature examination acquitted. Mr. *Blacklow*, when the Doctor said he was forced to this Government, smil'd; and asked me whether I thought the Doctor knew not that we understood how both himself and his Agents at Rome did accuse an innocent man (whom both my Lord and the Clergy desired for the Office) of *Jansenisme*, and hinder'd all satisfaction to be received, though the party protested neither to have read *Iansenius*, nor to know what his Doctrine was. As for the army of accusations he speaks of, Mr. *Blacklow* wonder'd at the strange information the Doctor hath, or at his vein in forging: For, first, the Letter was never sent to Paris: Secondly, there were no accusations in the Letter, it merely informing the Nuncio of certain reports cast out against him, and very prejudicial to his Colledge, withall desiring his Lord to seek out the truth, and amend them if he found them as was reported. But, what is most to the purpose, is that those who wrote had good information of the truth of what they inform'd; and some things were so evident that there was no possible denying them. However, he found means to cast a mist before the *Inter-nuncio's* eyes, which useth to be by getting Letters from men of Quality who know not particulars, but commend the person in common: By which any sleight answers usher'd in, easily finde acceptance.

Dr. Holden

I read

I read further how *he conjectures* these accusations came out of a Letter *he wrote* to the Assembly of 1653. and takes thereby occasion to tax Mr. *Blacklow*, of a Letter to one before a printed book. Mr. *Blacklow* answered, that he would'd he could descend to that scrupulosity as to say he could *conjecture* any thing, who had hitherto been so confident of the falsest and most groundlesse assertions that imagination could stumble on; and that, if his *assurances* be false, his *conjectures* must needs be weak; and so is this. For the information, sent to the *Nuncio*, proceeded from the reports of those, who came from his house, and from pure pity of the evil Government of a place so important, which they who wrote the Letter apprehended deeply. For what he talks of the effects of the Letter to the Assembly concerning Mr. *Blacklow*, he answered that they pleased him very well; for they were these, that they would not meddle with his Doctrine particularly, because my Lord had forbidden them to do so till it were censured at *Rome*. As for his Letter to the joynt-party, who subscribed with Dr. *Layburn*, whosoever reads the Epistle it self, which he subscribed, and Dr. *Layburn* has put in his Pamphlet, will finde that he deserved a sharp reprehension, which in the Letter sent to him is tempered with love and honour; and so the party himself said by it that he had punished him sufficiently, yet forsook not his friendship nor Mr. *Blacklow* his; for he was a man capable of reprehension, of wisdom & worth; and, if the Doctor had been such, he had had his share in it; but, taking him for a wilfull man, and obstinate in his ambitious way, he thought a touch of neglect was fitter for him.

I read farther concerning a Letter Mr. *Blacklow* wrote to my Lord, some part concerning the Doctor, and some part an *Irish* Bishop, who lived and died here; to which my Lord made answer, and sent him a Copy of the answer, some passages of which the Doctor hath set down here. He added also a Letter which he conceived to be written against my Lord by Mr. *Blacklow*, and sayes the Original is within his reach, and that Mr. *Blacklow* denied the Letter to be his. To these Mr. *Blacklow* replied, that he should have set down the occasion of his Letter to my Lord, which was that the

Doctor had calumniated the whole Assembly of 1653. to my Lord, of being contrary to his Authority, and procured a Decree of dissolution without any former inquisition: and, after that he knew his information to be false, yet by his Letters he maintained my Lord in the same opinion, and so far inveigled him by his continual Calumnies, that generally he neglected the advice of all others to follow his; and, waving to employ his Officers, which were grave men, employ'd young men whom the Doctor appointed him: This was the occasion of the Letter.

Now, Judge you whether in this case he were not bound to speak plainly, both to my Lord, and his sentiments, which by long experience he had of the Doctor; which would not have seemed so harsh had the Letter appeared; but my Lord, as prejudiced, gathered out those passages which set alone were invidious, and in his Letter to him shewed some effects of passion more (as he hoped) than he had, who was bound to expresse his sentiments in a private Letter to the Doctors Superiour.

Another piece of Legerdemain is that the Doctor having calumniated the whole Assembly, and his Letter relating to this onely, he layes disconformity in Doctrine to have been the ground of the difference between them; about which there was no controversie between my Lord and him after the Letters above cited.

As for the *Irish* Bishop, Mr. *Blacklow* said, I wrote what he was informed of him, and it was at his first coming when he as yet understood not the wayes of living in this place, nor was in good correspondence with his own Order; but, after some time, being better informed, he changed his course and lived and died in the respects and love of all who knew him; and particularly disliked my Lord's proceeding in publishing a private Letter of information to the parties of whom it was written, saying, *it could not stand with good Government.*

As for the Letter to the *Nuncio*, he wish'd the Doctor had exprest what fault he findes in it. Did it little concerne all the Catholicks of *England*, whether he had Authority over them, or no? Or, was not Mr. *Blacklow* bound in conscience

science to get the difficulty cleared if he could? Or did he presse any thing but to know the truth of a matter already passed? Where then lay his blame? His objection concerning his denying the Letter is answered thus. He was informed by ocular witnesses, that the Copy sent by the Doctor into *England* was corrupted, and so had no reason to engage himself in quarrels upon such a Copy which he could not acknowledge to be his. And for the Original, being within his reach, which is one of his great assurances, 't is a great mistake; For he having received an answer from the *Nuncio*, and others to whom it was sent, knows the contrary.

After this I came to the Doctors Arguments against Mr. *Blacklow* his Doctrine: which because they hold some five, or six leaves, I must cut into divers parcels according as they were answered. First, was objected some Doctors opinions of *Doway* and *Lovain*. As for *Doway* he replied, he did not wonder; for he supposed they perused not the books, but took the Doctors information, which was full of untruths. In the Doctor of *Louvain*'s answer he noted that there was not a word of his own liking, or disliking, but onely that by others the Doctrine was better liked than he expected. The next objection was that his Doctrine was injurious to Scripture: For the Scripture was *utilis ad coarguenda & refellenda falsa dogmata*, but that Mr. *Blacklow* sayes; it is no more proper *ad refellenda falsa dogmata*, than a beetle is to cut. The answer was, that Mr. *Blacklow* hath not any such, either words, or sence. The third objection was that he was injurious to Councils, and to the definition of Pope *Benedict* the 11th. The answer was, that the Doctor conceived Mr. *Blacklow* could not construe a piece of *Latin*, or knew not the signification of the word [*nox*.] Wherefore he challenged him, that if he could make any of his Grammer-School-boyes construe those words of the Council, [*Animas, quæ sunt purgata, in cælum nox recipi,*] to signifie that the Souls are purged before the day of judgement, he would yield his cause: If not, that the Doctor imposed upon, and abused the Council with his private spirit changing in it what he listed. He added that those words condemned the Doctor's opinion, which putteth

nothing to be purged in the Souls of Purgatory, and yet that they are not presently received into Heaven. So unhappy is the Doctor in his citations. As for the definition of *Benedict* the 11th. 't is in substance the same, in form lesse favourable to the Doctors opinion. And whereas the Doctor citeth *Benedict* to say that *John* the 22th. never held the opinion of no Saints going to Heaven before the last day, it is absolutely false and ignorance in History, for he onely testifieth that his Predecessour did not define it; and there is extant his revocation of it at his death: But the Doctor after he has put the question, whether Pope *John* held the opinion, changes it to defining; which had been a great fault in one of his meanest Logicians. He noted also that the Doctor thinks that to be Historically certain, and Theologically certain is all one; saying, that it is Theologically evident that no Pope hath erred defining as *Pastor Universalis Ecclesie*; which depends purely on History, and that obscurely enough. He adds that it is maintained by the whole current of Catholic Doctors; but, the best is, he appeals to them presently after, who know it to be false, and that the contrary opinion both is, and ever was held for a probable opinion. And, if he pleased to dispute the Question, he could produce quickly a dozen at least of great Authours, whereof some were Popes, or grave Cardinals for this opinion. But the Doctors assertion is so notoriously false, that 't is a shame to spend time about it. After this he saith, that 't is apparent to those, who have perused *Mr. Blacklow's* books, that he makes no use of Holy Scripture nor Authority. By which is made apparent that he hath not perused them, and therefore can be neither good censurer nor impugner of them. And otherwise his assertion is beyond excuse a manifest untruth; two of his books consisting in a manner wholly of Authority, and that thole two also which the Doctor most impugneth, to wit, those concerning Purgatory, and the Pope's personal infallibility. His other books are of such a nature as require to have no store of Authorities, being but *compendiums*, and therefore called *Institutions*; yet even in thole there are some. So far *Mr. Blacklow*.

The fourth Objection was, that he was injurious to the

Uni-

Universal practice of the Church, which sets up *priviledged Altars*, and to the particular of *those who live by the Altar*. The answer was, that the Doctor was mistaken in the signification of those words, [*the practise of the Church*] which is far different from the practise of *many in the Church*, even Church-men; as is evident by the eating two meals in the day, and such like practises generally used. Likewise in laying the *Office of our Lady* daily, or *Office of the dead*, or seven penitential Psalms in such dayes, in which the Clergy is invited to them by *Indulgences*. And the very name of *priviledges*, and the bestowing them for graces and rewards, which are specialties, show that, though many have them, yet are they no general practise, such as are those practises emergent out of faith. In the second point he said the Doctor had maliciously and wilfully abused him, applying those words of his, to all *those Priests who live by the Altar*, which he spoke onely of those, who made the Altar their occasion to live idly, and to apply themselves to nothing that becomes their function: Of which kinde of Priests all good men much complain.

There followed a Discourse to shew that even in Divinity, Mr. B. his opinion was false. To which he answered, that he would not examine his high Divinity. But that his Scripture seemed very pleasant; For it would make a man think he apprehended the Devil has a pair of Leggs, and goes locally out of a converted man, and walks himself weary in dry and waterlesse grounds, and hereupon changes his minde, and gets a will of returning back; and not that all this is spoken by our Saviour Allegorically, and is performed meerly by the Devil's watching his time to tempt. Besides, what change of minde is it in one, who is violently cast out of his home, to desire to return back? which is truly to continue the same will, and the same minde still? In the second testimony he reflects not that it is a pure conjecture that the Devil did send those dreams to *Pilate's* wife, and more likely that they were from God. And, if they were from the Devil, yet must he prove they were from the same Devil, ere he can prove hence that the Devil changes his minde; which I believe, no Commentary saith. For his citing of the *Thomists*

mist: Doctrine, he answered that in regard he cite's no Author, and there be divers sorts of *Thomists*, it is of no account and signifies nothing.

There followed in the Doctors discourse, how, when he *was Superiour in England*, one *dying would leave no Alms to M. Bl. his adherents*. The reply was that the said party was abused, and told that Mr. *Bl.* denied prayer for the dead, whereas they, who understand his Doctrine, say that he teacheth it more than others. And so, that man's Executrix, being informed of the truth, was so grieved, that she bestowed something out of her own purse, her Uncle's money being all distributed before. And the truth is, the interested party would seem to conceive that they, who hold the point of souls not going out before the day of judgement, also pray that they may not go out of Purgatory before then; for else what are their prayers worse than others? and if they communicate no Alms, it must be out of revenge and malice. As for his noting that this was done while *he was Superiour in England* (as the Doctor affects much to talk of his *Superiourship*, and *Grand-vicarship*) Mr. *Bl.* said he did not remember he was ever *Superiour* here, though he did, that he was joynt Vicar-General with another, whom the Clergy had desired of my Lord for that Office. But that to have a special service should make a man a *Superiour* he never heard; no more, than that being a Bayliffe makes a man master of the Tenants: Nor did he ever hear that his fellow assumed so insolent a Title.

Proceeding forwards, I came to two instructions he professes to give the Clergy; which when I had read, Mr. *Bl.* wondered at the arrogance of the man, who would undertake to instruct the Clergy, in which there are so many able to instruct him. He said he would not take notice of the sillinesses and mistakes contained in them, which were not few; besides, the instructions themselves were such as none of his brethren could be ignorant of. He added that whereas the Doctor talked of *Novelties in Doctrine*, he was quite besides the Saddle, making no distinction between *Divinity* and *Faith*; and applying the Fathers speeches of Faith to Divinity. Whereas, as far as divinity is not demonstrated, novel-

velty is not onely lawfull, but sometimes necessary; for otherwise the Church should have no means to get out of errour and incertitude in Theological points; and this novelty must begin by some one man. But this he spake not in respect of his own Doctrine, which was the ancient Doctrine, as partly he had shown when he was forced to it, partly could shew when like occasion offered it self. He marked also that the Doctor lost his Text, to have a gird at his Fellow-Vicar's Sub-deanship; citing my Lord's not making him such. But he either did not know, or dissembles that his Lordship being informed that the Sub-deanship he practised was no dignity, but onely a deputation from the Chapter, which belong'd to the ancientest Canon, when there was no Election, was content, and professed not to meddle with that. He noted also his jeering at the resignation of Deanship to him, calling it a *Legacie in articulo mortis*; whereas it was made before any suspicion of extraordinary sicknesse, and long before the resigner's death, as *Mr. Fitton's* own Letters testify.

At last we came to the *Postscript*, in which the Doctor professeth that in thirty years acquaintance he had never done *Mr. Bl.* any wrong. To which *Mr. Bl.* reply'd, that for their acquaintance he thought it was of some two, or three and forty years, for he knew the Doctor a School-boy, himself being then a man; and in all this time he never complained of him before this last Letter, though he heard for many years of the evil Offices he did betwixt my Lord and him; and, these later years, both of his jeerings at good Tables in *England*, and since in his own house, and of a Ballad made against him, whereof some verses had in them his accustomed jeers. Nor, if his last Letter had aimed no farther than the disgrace of his own person, and not at the mischief of the publick, would he have taken notice of it.

But, to come to some of the reasons of the falling out on the Doctors part (for *Mr. Bl.* said that on his he never fell out, unless the answering his Calumnies be counted falling out) the first he remembered was that, after *Dr. Kellison's* death, the Doctor's friends in the house proposing his prefer-

ment to the succession, and wanting some money, he procured a Letter from my Lord to possess himself of a little summe that he knew to be in Mr. *Bl.* his disposition; and, being refused, grew so hot that he affronted the whole company, in which were divers better than himself. A second was, that, being disgusted, he could not govern in *Dr. Champney's* time, he would have brought in a *PRÆPOSITUS*, who was designed a Kinsman of his, whom he might govern; and so have onted not only *Dr. Champney*, but my Lord and Episcopal power too. Which design he conceived *Mr. Bl.* defeated, and gave thereupon a bad Character of him to the Agent, who resided then here for his *Holiness*. A third was his setting of odds betwixt my Lord and the whole Assembly of the Clergy; which obliged *Mr. Bl.* to send his opinion of him plainly to my Lord as to his Superiour. The fourth may be because the Doctor accounts him a Defender of the *Chapter*; whereof, though he professeth himself a Member to have present intelligence, and a future hand in Government, if he cannot get above it, yet all his informations are to the disparagement of it, though it cost him so many falsehoods; as also his discourses and Letters where he is confident. And, when he was in Authority, waving it, he cull'd out a meeting of his own to do some business he intended, but failed of, and now lately was upon the same design to waver the *Chapter*, and send his Orders to the ancient Priests, that is to whom he pleases, and in this very Pamphlet strives to set division betwixt the consult in *London* and their brethren, to take away that little order which is left among them. Nor do we onely see his designs here to make himself Superiour; but it is written also from beyond Sea, by such as cannot be suspected to bear him malice, that he, by his Agents, hath acted against Episcopal power, and that he cares not what Authority be brought in, so it lights upon his head; and, because he thinks *Mr. Bl.* may be a means to hinder this design, therefore he is so violent against his Doctrine. And so ended his answer to the Doctor's first part.

The second part begins with an accusation of *Mr. Bl.* his reproachfull language, as calling him *Mad-man* and *Sycophant*,

phant, and the Doctorss holy acceptance of such injuries. *Mr. Bl.* hereupon asked me whether it were all one for a man to be indeed mad, and to do some actions of a Mad-man? or to call one a Sycophant, and to say, if he does so he is a Sycophant? and affirmed that these were the sense of his words, the first after proof, the latter ushering in the proof. As for the term of *hissing Serpent*, it is a Scripture-expression of a calumniatour, and so was but the varying of the phrase. He added that he challenged the Doctor, or any of his party to shew that he had written one word unbecoming the fact he proved against the Doctor, and he would do him satisfaction. Otherwise he understood not that accusers used complements in their accusations, or spake not the Crimes by their own names. As for his *holy acceptance* of them, which he, so like a Saint, professes, he wish't his actions were conformable to his words; For holy words with contrary actions is Hypocrisy added to misdeeds.

I read on the Doctors reply to what *Mr. Bl.* had excepted against his first Objection, concerning external sin without consent of the minde. It began with the Doctors asseveration that he had added nothing to the Regular's words. *Mr. Bl.* answered that he expected either the Regular's own subscription, or at least some bodies that had heard him speak, and that it was a weak conceit to ground and propose a calumny of that nature to all our brethren, upon no other Authority to make it good, than meerly his own bare asseveration; which ought to be of no value in his own cause, especially against an Adversary both renouncing and detesting the wicked sense the Doctor objects it in, and showing in his books, publick and extant, that they ground the quite contrary Doctrine. The next part of the Doctor's answer was that he would make it clearly appear, that *to commit an external sin remaining in charity, and yet so go to heaven* (which *Mr. Bl.* acknowledged, and called the *body* of the report) doth necessarily require the circumstances of [*destructive of Religion and morality*] which he called the *Vesture*. *Mr. Bl.* drew out his Answer and shewed me these words; [*For dressing, he adds Mr. Bl. pretends that the Soul may do well, when the flesh does ill,*] and added, is this to use common honesty thus manifest-

ly to change the plain words and sence of the Writer? For, it was the Doctors false and groundlesse imposing this *pretence* now mentioned, which Mr. Bl. called the *Vesture*, or *dressing*, not those other words he dissemblingly substitutes. The like fraud he uses concerning the Regular's report. For Mr. Bl. having said the Regular would spit in his face, if he should say he had told him that Mr. Bl. *pretended the body might do ill and the soul well*; He in common sayes that Mr. Bl. affirms the Regular would spit in his face for venting a report the Regular himself had spread: We came afterwards to the Doctors proof, which was no better than his own bare asseveration that Mr. Bl. *assertion imports so sweet an agreement betwixt charity and exterior sin, that it would infallibly invise frail nature to sin exteriorly*. Mr. Bl. replied he was ashamed to have to do with a man who had so little understanding in Divinity, as not to know the general *Tenet* of Divines, Lawyers and Mankind to be, that an exterior sin may be committed without knowledge, or consent, much lesse without sweet harmony with charity. The next part of the Answer was, that *Lot had lost his charity by being twice drunk*; and that the blessing of progeny was no Argument, because *Thamar* had a greater, and the *Midwives* who saved the *Jews* Children were likewise rewarded, *though they told a ly*. Mr. Bl. said he admired the Doctors boldnesse to censure a Saint, and surnamed *just* in the Scripture, as *Lot* is, for being cozen'd into drunkennesse, if so much be true; for *inebriari* amongst the *Hebrews* doth not still signifie so much; and his shortnesse of understanding, as not to see, he yields the whole question; if *Lot* sinned not the first time, which he grants when he sayes, that *at least he lost his charity the second bowr*. Nor is his rashnesse much lesse in censuring *Judah* and *Thamar*; whereof *Thamar* had the testimony from *Judah* to be *juster than he*, being freed from all punishment as soon as her fact was understood; and plainly sought by her action what God granted her, to have the *Messias* spring from her, and to raise a family to her first husband, which was then a custome, and afterwards enacted for a Law by God and *Moses*; and therefore it must be supposed she proceeded in an innocent ignorance, and consequently that she should not be temerarily cen-

confured. *Judah's* action, whatsoever it was in his heart, was not of that quality as in those times, God took notice of, to hinder blessings deserved by other services, or titles, and is esteemed a Saint, as the rest of his brethren Patriarchs, amongst whom were greater sins than his. He added, he had reason to expect no other at the Doctors hands than the Saints did finde. The example of the *Egyptian* Midwives he neglected; saying, the Doctor could not be so simple as not to see that the *saving of the Children* for which they were rewarded, was a different action from their lying to excuse themselves. Lesse to the purpose was *Sr. Austins* speech of the *Romans*, being rewarded for their moral virtues, there being in the testimony no sin objected, which is all our question.

There follows in the Doctor his Reply to *Mr. Blacklow*, his charging him with calumny for saying *he knows his accusation to be true*, and that it is *verbatim in his writings*, that the happiness of the damned exceeded all the happiness of this life; the contrary to which he shew'd him out of his writings in expresse terms. His first excuse is that he doubts *Mr. Blacklow* hath not cited the place truly, because in another place there is corruption. Secondly, he sayes that the sense is there, though the words be not, & that the particle *verbatim* could not mean more than that only the sense was there ((so that the plain adverb *verbatim* must quite lose it's signification to save the Doctor innocent from an, other-wise, unavoidable falsification.) Thirdly, the Doctor would club his opinion into an Heresie, pretending still most shamelessly (against plainly contrary words brought to his face) that his opinion is, *the happiness of the Devils is greater than any worldly happiness*: And that, to say *their pains were pure volitions* was again an Heresie; Nay, that to deny material fire in Purgatory, is next to Heresie, if not Heresie. *Mr. Bl.* reply'd, with a sigh; Oh, how irksome it is to have to do with one, who throws his verdicts at random, without ever considering how easily they are convinced, nor understands the question he talks of. As for his suspicious, he may know that I have his own hand to shew for what I say: and why doth not he produce that place of mine, which he thinketh himself sure to be corrupted? This a solid and sincere

cere man should have done, and not ground all things thus upon his own bare word. Mr. *Bl.* added that the Question being whether the possession of goods without having *content* in them makes one *happy*, the Doctor is so wise as to say Mr. *Blackf.* affirms the Devils are happy, because they *have* great goods; which is wilfully, or ignorantly to misse the question; yet this is the substance of his answer; and particularly he takes without proof, that the damned, notwithstanding their perversnesse, *enjoy* the goods they *have*; making no distinction between *possession* and *fruition*, nor understanding that their perversnesse consists in *diligere panas*, and *nolle cavere eis*, which import no pleasure but obstinacy; and, even in this world are found with grief, and causes of grief. Neither is there any sence in his rambling into the Apocalypse, where it is said that the damned shall cry to the Hills, *Cadite super nos*; for who denies tear in the damned? His answer likewise to the example of *Antiochus* straves totally from the question; which was whether his Kingdoms made him *happy*, he not taking *content* in them as before? in stead of answering which, the learned Doctor, very soberly, tells us the reason why he took no content in them, & never shows that he was *happy* without this content, for the bare having them, which onely belongs to the question. The next *Heretic* of denying material fire, he would prove from the Council of *Florence*, where just the contrary was agreed upon; that both parties, *Latines* and *Greeks*, might continue their own opinions, the one to hold material fire in Purgatory, the other to hold none; & therefore, I suppose this Doctor will perswade none but fools of his silly assertion, that *the whole current of Doctors in the Catholick Church censure the opinion which denies material fire*, as temerarious, or next to *Heretic*, whereas none dares censure it, by reason of the Authority of the Council, in which, after debate, neither opinion was forbidden. Lastly, he noted that the opinion, which the Doctor cries out on as *Heretic*, to wit, that the pains of the damned are voluntary acts, is the common opinion of all Divines: For even those, who put material fire say that it is elevated to produce acts of the will, which they acknowledge to be voluntary acts: wherefore he may do well to plead his Scripture and

and consequences against them, and not against Mr. *Bl.* who condemns the opinion of God's producing voluntary acts in the damned, by the force of fire, as well as the Doctor himself. And what difficulty, that they might be saved if they will, is, by reason of their obstinacy in wickedness, they cannot will it. So perfectly is this bold scribler ignorant in all he talks of.

Yet, as ignorance is oft the Mother of confidence, he will needs *demonstrate* his tenet of material fire from Scripture; alleading two places, *Ite maledicti in ignem aeternum*, and that of the rich Glutton, *crucior in hac flamma*; which he urges in a literal rigour, without ever thinking of the Rule of Faith, the only certain Interpreter of Scripture, in matters of Faith, or of Science, which interprets it in points belonging to their own Sphear. It were enough then to enervate his pretended Demonstration to reply, as Catholick Doctors use to do to Protestants, that *no Scripture is of private Interpretation*; or to ask him vvith vvhat confidence he presumes to *demonstrate* upon his own fancy (for those most sacred Oracles) or how he can demonstrate any thing from Scripture, till the sence of that place, whence he would demonstratively inferre, be concluded and evinced; since demonstrations consist in the connexion of notions and sence, not of aire and words. But let us scan his places in their literal and critical rigour. The first is *Ite in ignem aeternum*; after which immediately follow, though he omits them, *paratum Diabolo & Angelis ejus*. Which makes it far from making that place conclude for material and natural fire, since it declares it self to speak of that sort of fire, which is adapted and fitted to spiritual substances: And what kinde of fire this is, must (in case the Rule of Faith show it not) be learn't from that Science, which treats of spiritual Natures. Besides, the Dr. should shew that Hell, & material fire were made before the damning of the Devils, wch is a hard task, especially if they were damned in Heaven. Again, in the last *vers.* of *Mat. 25.* where the effect is exprest, it is said, *to everlasting punishment*, and not to material fire; now, (spiritual punishment is known not to be grief; as *life eternal*, which is opposed to it in the same verse, is known not to be a material, or external Kingdom (which

was opposed to fire, *vers.* 34. and 41.) but the internal acts of the blessed, to which in good sence the internal acts of the damned must be opposed. His second place whence he would demonstrate this, is far more pittifull; for this, if understood literally (as he would have it) signifies as well that spirits have *real tongues*, and that water would quench, or cool that fire (as appears by the Glutton's request to *Abraham*) and so, could the Devils come at water, all would be well with them; according to this Doctrine, at least, those Devils, who possess the Hogs were befriended by our Saviour, when they run into the Sea by his permission; for, I conceive, there was water enough in the Sea; and not onely drops to cool, but deluges to quench all the fire the Dr. assigns them. Is not this a grave Divine? We acknowledge indeed, in *St. Austins* meaning, though not in the Doctors grosse application, the Rule of interpreting Scripture literally, *cum fieri possit sine fidei & morum prejudicio*; for, First the Doctor distinguishes not the Grammatical and Rhetorical expression; whereas, it is ridiculous to explicate Metaphors Grammatically; as if one should say, when the Church sings *Flammæ amoris excitas*, the literal sence should be that a Faggot of love was set on fire in our breasts. Again, it is manifest in *St. Austin*, that whatsoever is against Science, he takes it to be *in prejudicium fidei*, as making our faith ridiculous to Philosophers: So that, if Divels, or Souls to be burn't, or turn'd into Ashes be against Philosophy, *St. Austin* would account it to be *in prejudicium fidei*: and so the Doctor must show that this is not a Rhetorical expression, nor against Philosophy, before he can presse the Authority of *St. Augustin*.

After this the Doctor comes to discover more *Heresies* in *Mr. Bl.* his books. And first he objects it is a *blasphemy* to say that God should be worse if the damned had not been damned, and sayes, *it is as soon confused as open'd*, and afterwards putteth an argument to prove it. *Mr. Bl.* reply'd that in this point he pardon'd the Doctor, it depending upon too large a discourse for one, who doth not peruse his book, and yet will needs fall to censure. But, if truly the Doctor had been able to open the opinion, he would have found it to be the greatest honour of God, both in his own attributes, and

in the Government of this world, which mankind esteems of. In his own attributes, because it taketh God to be essentially wise, even to the least circumstance, and that he would be worse if he did any thing otherwise, than according to the Rule of wisdom, and that wisdom in all things is the principle to his Will; whence follows that if it be better to let the damned be damned, than not, he should not have done so wisely as he now does, if they had not been damned; and therefore had been lesse wise, that is, worse in himself. In his Government, because it declares that in that very operation in which Creatures seem to be worst handled, even there they have the greatest goods, which were possible to them. To his arguments he answers, that when the Doctor asks whether God, *before the Creation*, had not the perfection of the world in himself, he dares say the Doctor understands not what [*before*] in that question signifies, and thinks that God was before Creatures in time, and takes eternity to be an infinite length of time. Secondly, he thinks the question is of the *plenitude of perfection* in God Almighty, whereas it is of his *wisdom*; which not being thought on by the Doctor, he, by consequence, quite mist the whole question; which is so common with him, that it seems even natural to his low pitch of understanding. Mr. Blackl. was proceeding to his second argument, when I advertised him that the next objection concerned the same matter, yvhereupon he bad me read forward.

The next objection therefore was that it was an impiety and *prophane novelty*, to say that *Christ died not for any thing, or person, which was not granted him*: Mr. Bl. reply'd that the Objectour calls St. *Anſtin*, it seems, an *impious and prophane Novellist*, who holds it in expresse terms. But, quoth he, that which would be thought strange in another is that in the very same place the contrary is taught expressly, to wit, that he died also for the damned, and that the whole question betwixt parties is but of words, the meaning being the same of both: So that the honest Doctor first tells a shamelesse untruth, and then makes an invective against the person; and this is a sample of the *integrity* he made to holy a Profession of pag. 7. to his friends, and according as he should

make it appear, desired he might stand, or fall in their judgments: And, if they be candid, I dare promise he shall have his wish. Moreover, if he understood his own words, the *Antecedent will of God*, which he goes about to prove against Mr. Bl. is in this case maintained by him: But it were too much to presse him so far.

When I had read the third Objection, which was that the Sacraments do work *ex opere operato*, he said, the Doctor was constant to his Principles, and to the *Integrity* he made so Saint-like a Profession of. For first, in the *Latin Text* he adds those words [*sententiam asserentem sacramenta nova Legis causare gratiam ex opere operato*] and by adding them makes him hold the contrary; against the very title of the Chapter, which is *Quomodo Sacramenta conferant gratiam ex opere operato*, which manifestly supposes him to hold and grant that, they do cause grace *ex opere operato*, and onely to explicate *how*, and in what manner they cause it thus: Again, this calumniating pretence of his is against the whole beginning of the Chapter, which is spent in declaring and averring that they do conferre Grace *ex opere operato*, and those words which are cited truly by the Doctor, are spoken against an opinion father'd upon the Council of *Trent*, about the manner *how* they conferre Grace *ex opere operato*, which cannot be framed out of the words of the Council, but is rather against them. Again, in his *English* meaning he gives to his words, he imposes on him an opinion, the contrary to which in the whole fifth Lesson he maintains; to wit, that the Sacraments do *physicè* efficere their proper Grace, and, by connexion to that, sanctifying Grace; which is the most rigorous opinion of the Divines about the efficacy of the Sacraments, and the very words of the Council of *Trent*, that they do *continere*, and *conferre gratiam quam significant*. Is it possible any should be so weak as to give credit to this man, after such manifold and wilfull frauds, or think his profession of *integrity* any thing else, but a Cloak for his malicious Hypocrisy?

Mr. Bl. Ceasing, I went on to the third Errour objected, which was that Mr. Bl. subjected Princes to be punished by the Law of reason; which he calls *inauditum figmentum*. When he heard

heard the whole place in the Doctor read, he shook his head and cried *Semper idem*: Replying that the first untruth was that *Mr. Bl.* pretends his whole scope in writing rules of Government was to heighten and commend the exemptions from written Law, or custome of the Common-wealth, which *Mr. Bl.* pretends onely of one single discourse, peradventure of the length of a Leaf, or two. Next, the Doctor thinks it is to debase a Prince to bring him to be judged, or punished when the Law of reason requires: forgetting that men be governed by Reason, because it is their nature; and that he is a beast that is not; and therefore, what Reason commands, must be done, because it is Reason it should be done. Besides, he omits that *Mr. Bl.* never allows this circumstance, but when a Prince is dispossessed and in the power of the dispossessor, and he in quiet and lawfull possession of his estate. That he calleth it *figmentum antea inauditum*, shows his ignorance in History; in which there be so many unfortunate Princes, both in the Roman History and in the Christian, imprisoned and hardly used.

I read next, how the Doctor, first acknowledged himself to be ignorant, then went about to disprove it, and retort the same upon *Mr. Bl.* whose defence was, that he should have been glad to hear him acknowledge himself ignorant, if his deeds were conformable to his words, and that he would behave himself as a one that accounts himself ignorant should. But he that will meddle so boldly with Divinity questions, as he hath done both in his first Letter, & this second Pamphlet. He that will venture thus blindfold to club Heresies faster than fence: He that, against his Superiour's command, will prosecute his violence against Doctrines; and undertake upon his own head to censure opinions never censured before, which is the Master-piece of Divinity; For this man to profess ignorance shows more of the Wolf in Sheep's clothing, than of the true Sheep. He said also that his proofs for his learning were rather proofs that he had, or was esteemed to have a good purse than much learning: For conclusions are not called *Pulchra*, for being learned, but for being well printed, or having a fair Picture, or Arms upon them, and for the making of his *Theses*, the Idea of solid Doctrine in the Uni-

verſity, he needed to have brought a ſtrong Authour to perſwade them that know him of ſo incredible a vanity, and not ground it upon his own words. As for his being deſired to defend again, 't is known that in occaſion of great Aſſemblies, Defendants are ſought, who will bear out their Acts ſplendidly, and not the beſt Schollers : Again, that he made or compiled his concluſions himſelf is no proof that he, underſtood them, for he might take them out of other mens writings. But, becauſe nothing can paſſe without ſome untruth in this Doctors writings, he was pleaſed here to tell us that *Mr. Bl.* made certain concluſions for a friend of his in *Paris*, which contained, both erroneous opinions and falſe *Latin*. The report is abſolutely falſe, that he either made them, or ſaw them before they were printed, nor was in *Paris* : ſure he is, he was not at the Act. Secondly, the Doctor inſolently cenſures what the Cenſors of *Paris* approved, and was well accepted of in the Univerſity. Thirdly, he wonders the Doctor ſhould at leaſt charge him with falſe *Latin* in ſo plain a piece as *Theſes* ought to be ; which ſhould have been an Argument to him (if paſſion had permitted) of the untruth of his report.

This falſhood he ſaid was accompanied with a greater about *Mr. Bl.* his flying ſuddenly out of *Portugal* for his *Theſes*, terrified at the Inquiſitions proceeding's againſt them. For, though it be true they were put in the Inquiſition by malice the very day they ſhould have been defended to affront him ; Yet, this was done after they had been approved ſix ſeveral times by ſeveral men appointed by the Inquiſition ; which argues the other was onely a trick put upon him. Beſides, the information was never follow'd, and the *Theſes* were approved afterwards in the Univerſity of *Conimbra*. As for his flying away, or quitting the place ſuddenly, (which was the ſecond part of the Doctors tale) let him inform himſelf of any that was there, and he may know that he ſtay'd afterwards till the Founder ſent him to the Court of *Spain* about a buſineſſe of great conſequence ; which being diſpatch'd with ſucceſſe, he returned to *Portugal*, and ſtay'd again there, till the Founder ſent him again into *England* about another buſineſſe, with expreſſe charge not to return if he perform'd

not

not his errand, which he professed to him before-hand he could not do. All which *Mr. Bl.* declared to his Assistants, who intreated him to get them also away, if he returned not himself; and so, declaring the Founder's minde to the Inquier, took his leave of him, and came away publickly. Nor was he blamed for coming away, but for not returning to defend *Theses*, in causing which the Doctor had his share. For *Mr. Bl.* his chief errand being to carry Divines from *Doway* thither, and some opposition being made in the consult at *London*, (at which the Doctor was present) it was resolved that *Mr. Bl.* should carry a Letter from the Consult to *Doway* in his favour, yet should accept of Humanists if he could not obtain Divines; and expresse command given that this clause should be kept from *Dr. Kellison*. But our obedient Doctor, against the command and bond of silence and truth to the Clergy, writ to *Dr. Kellison* how the Clergy would be content though he sent no Divines. Which Letter *Dr. Kellison* read to *Mr. Bl.* untill he came to these words [*This to your self*] which closed that businesse; by which taking himself in the surprize, he read no farther. So that *Mr. Bl.* was forced to accept of *Humanists*, and not to return by the Founder's order.

The Doctor saith, his conference with shame is a dream, but let him know that those, who carried him thither are yet alive. He objects *Mr. Bl.* his conference with *Chillingworth*; who peradventure vaunted himself, for, self-conceit and interest push't him thereto; but, Catholicks, who were present were so well satisfied, as that they desired another after Dinner, and *Chillingworth's* own party reported, that he was too hard for all others, but that *Mr. Bl.* held him to it, and hereupon he was in credit with them ever after.

The ensuing part contain'd the Doctors impugnations of two points; of the Souls durance in *Purgatory*, & the Pope's personal infallibility. When I had read it, *Mr. Bl.* answered that he did well to begin with an untruth to usher in a like Discourse. For the man, he impudently named for *Mr. Bl.* his Secretary, was neither asked advice, nor knew any thing farther than in publick he had profest, untill he saw it finished. So that the *Dr.* casts about his calumnies at random, light they

they where they will. Yet he thought the Dr. had had so much knowledge in humanity Books, as to understand that men frame the fashion of their writings according to their occasions; and this the rather, because he findes that the Dr. hath herein imitated him. Neither yet doth he believe he had a Secretary, notwithstanding the like frame of his Discourse (though he entitle his Treatise a *summe of his Answer*, whereas Mr. Bl. called his, his own Answer) for that he seeth the Doctors weaknesse, and humour and phrase throughout it all. Neverthelesse, if he did, he would not be so uncivil as to name him in print, as the Doctor most indiscreetly does friends and foes, without respect, where his occasion serves. As concerning the Doctors impugnation of Mr. Bl. sayings about the Pope's personal infallibility, he said they were meer flashes of words against experience, & therefore would spend no time in answering them. And as for his objecting to Mr. Bl. his comparison of *deflowring sacred Virgins upon an Altar*, he said, it still more and more shew'd the Doctors weaknesse; For who can doubt but the corruption of all Christian faith in the root, and the making all our faith uncertain, is greater than any particular sin. Besides, there were other comparisons of greater force than this, which the Dr. neglects, to take notice of one whole force consists in a vulgar apprehension. As for the second point Mr. Blacklow affirmed that if the Doctor had any friend, who perused his books, he might know that the places of St. *Austin*, for Souls not being perfectly purged till the day of judgement, be recorded in his Treatise *de medio statu*. But how ignorant the Dr. is in St. *Austin*, he could not chuse but shew, who cites first a place out of his 15th. book *de Trin.* where the Saint teacheth nothing, but that they, who dy without sin go immediately to Heaven without any thought of Purgatory, as appears there by these words; *Ad agnum pertinentes, quando, sine hujus vite, resolvuntur a corpore, in eis retinendis non habent invida potestates* — *Promde liberi a Diaboli potestate, suscipiuntur ab Angelis sanctis, &c.* — *Constituuntur autem purgati ab omni cogitatione corruptionis in placidis sedibus donec recipiant corpora sua.* He added that the Doctors interpretation of this place was perfect non-sence. For what can this mean

mean that *St. Austin*, or any body else should place^d those Souls, which immediately go to Heaven out of their bodies (of which he plainly speaks) to expect their bodies after their purgation. Be Souls in Heaven to be purged? or the bodies which being turned into other Creatures have now no foulness in them? His next Testimony is none of *St. Austin's*, yet of a Saint, and speaketh clearly of the day of judgement, and what passeth then, and so is a clear Testimony for *Mr. Bl.* his opinion. For the Homily it self is *de resurrectione Domini*, and begins thus, *Resurrectio & glorificatio D. nostri Jesu Christi ostendit nobis vitam quam accepturi sumus cum venerit retribuere digna dignis, mala malis, bona bonis*. Which manifests that the whole Scope of the Homily is in order to that day, to wit, the day of judgement. Thence he proceeds, *Interim donec veniat ILLA DIES* (that is, the day of judgement) *studeamus, &c.* And so goes on showing what shall happen to the three sorts of Christians at that day; nor, in his transition to those that are to passe through the purging fire, hath he any the least expression in order to any other circumstance of time, but on the contrary avouches it to be then, by making those words *Fluvius igneus currebat ante eum*, signify the fire of Purgatory; now, when can a fiery flood be said to run before our Saviour, but when he himself is coming, that is at the day of judgement; at which time *St. Paul* teacheth us that fire shall go before him? Again, this place affirms that the *multitude of lesser sins* (that is, by-affections) and ill thoughts, *illie exulabunt, shall be purged out in that fire*; which cannot agree to the opinion of the intermediate fire, for this opinion puts no by-affections remaining there at all, nor that this fire purges them, or works any change in their thoughts at all, but onely penally afflicts them. So that the whole intent and sense of this place is quite opposite to the Doctors *Tenet*; and for *Mr. Blacklow's*, though produced against it. But the Doctor makes no reckoning of such small differences. Another thing *Mr. Blacklow* occasionally noted, and 't was this, that though both this Testimony and others objected by him (particularly those of Pope *Bened. Et.* and the Council of *Florence*) be objected by himself in his own books, and solutions there given to them,

yet the solid Doctor onely transcribes the objections; and urges the raw places against him, never taking notice of his solutions there given, much lesse disamulling them; The next calumny of the Doctors was his affirming, without limitation, or restriction, that Mr. *Blacklow* says, *Visions are old wives tales*, pag. 39. and afterwards in his Letter to two makes it one of the heads against him; whereas he never spoke of more than one, which he conceives to be a *dream*, not a *Vision*. For Visions in general, Mr. *Blacklow* acknowledges many to be true, but says that many reputed such, are uncertain, because they depend on the credit of some one person, the which is often weak, and not to be trusted in such difficult matters to judge of.

This finished, I told Mr. *Blacklow* there was a short Letter behind; the which, though written onely to two Persons, and so might easily have been twice transcribed, yet, the Doctor thought worth the printing. When I had read it, Mr. *Blacklow* said he had little to answer, it being but a bundle of untruths grounded upon his own word. He accuseth the Consult of seven, or eight of the gravest of his own body of what they never did, and aims to bring them into contempt amongst their Brethren, and so to destroy the little Union he hath left amongst them. Secondly, he thanketh two, whereof the first did as much as any of his fellows, the other was absent, and heard nothing of the business; and in a private Letter accuseth another, who was not in the Kingdom. His invectives against Mr. *Blacklow* are already shown to be calumnies. And so God forgive him and me both our faults. Then intreating me to have for awhile the Pamphlet, at the restoring it, he brought me this Paper.

BEcause the Doctors Partials vaunt his Pamphlet as
 Every modest and censure my answer to his former
 Letter very hardly, I shall set down a list of his fair dealing
 in the following heads. Neither will I touch his accusing
 me of prophane Novelties, upon his own words,
 or of some interested Regulars, and such as follow their
 Authority, (whereas they are no Novelists, but the contrary,

rary, and still tend to take away prophaneſſe in Doctrin,
which corrupts piety in the Church,) but onely his con-
ſcienceleſſe calumnies, his plain falſifications, his Taunts
and Jeers, &c.

Conſcienceleſſe Calumnies.

1. Againſt the Conſult which never meddled in this buſi-
neſſe, pag. 3.
2. Of my Lord Biſhop's command to ſuppreſſing Do-
ctrine, pag. 8.
3. Of my decrying him in companies, pag. 10.
4. Of his writing a civil Letter unto me, and my being
incenſed with it, pag. 10. and 11.
5. Of my ſending a Letter to *Paris* againſt him, and its
being remitted to *Bruffels*, pag. 11.
6. How that Letter was occaſion'd by one he wrote to
the Aſſembly of 1653, pag. 14.
7. That my Letter to the *Nuncio* at *Paris* was ſufficient
to confirm a calumny againſt the Aſſembly the Doctor had
made to my Lord, pag. 22.
8. He charges me with hainous Crimes upon inconfide-
rable grounds, from pag. 25. to pag. 34.
9. Againſt the Sub-dean-ſhip of the Chapter, pag. 41.
42.

In the ſecond part.

1. That it was onely his deſign in his firſt Letter to
awake Mr. *Blacklow*, pag. 4. The Letter it ſelf ſhews the con-
trary, as appears in the Liſt ſet down hereafter.
2. That he is aſſured Mr. *Bl.* hath corrupted his firſt
Letter, pag. 7.
3. That Mr. *Bl.* elevates the happineſſe of the damned
above the happineſſe of this world, pag. 7.
4. He accuses me of *Heretic*, or ſomething next to *Heretic*,
for denying material fire in Purgatory, pag. 19.
5. That I made a Doctors conclusions in *Paris*, contain-
ing dangerous opinions, pag. 30.
6. That, terrified at the Inquiſitions proceedings, I fled,
out of *Portugal*, pag. 31.

7. That my Disputation with *Chilling-worth* was a great disadvantage to the Catholick cause, pag. 32.

8. That a man named by him was either Counsellour, or Secretary in my answer to his first Letter, *ibid*.

9. That he accuseth me of committing an unpardonable sin against the holy Ghost, pag. 37.

10. That he sayes I call Visions generally old vvives tales, pag. 39.

11. In his Letter to two he repeats diverse of these Calumnies.

HIS FALSIFICATIONS.

1. That Mr. *Bl.* sayes the Scripture is not fit, *ad refellenda falsa dogmata*, pag. 25.

2. His interpretation of the Council of *Florence* & *Benedictus* his Bull, pag. 26, 27.

3. His applying of *Benedictus* his Bull, and *Johannes* 22th, his Errour, which are concerning Saints to Mr. *Bl.* his Doctrine, which is about when the purgation of Soules ends, pag. 30.

4. And 5th. His attributing to holy Scripture that sentence that *zelus animarum* is *divinorum diviniſſimum*, pag. 35. as also the words *non es amicus Caesaris*, to be spoken as a reproach against Christ, pag. 5.

6. That the wit of Serpents is to passe through little holes according to Christ, pag. 36.

In the second part.

1. Whereas Mr. *Bl.* putteth the vesture of his proposition expressly in one thing; he expressly sayes he puts it in another, pag. 7.

2. He imposes a false, and quite contrary sense on Mr. *Bl.* his words, concerning the damned, pag. 11, and 13.

3. He goes about to maintain the falsification by justifying his leaving out the antecedent, and subsequent words in that small Paragraph, which manifestly put the contrary to what he pretended, pag. 12.

4. He sayes the Council of *Florence* maintains there is fire in Purgatory, whereas all the Greek Fathers were against it, and the Council contradicted it not, pag. 18.

5. He

5. He sayes that the whole current of Doctors in the Catholick Church, unanimously condemne the opinion, which denies fire in Purgatory, pag. 19.

6. He accuses Mr. *Bl.* to say that Christ died not for all, whereas, take the whole place and, he sayes the quite contrary, pag. 23.

7. He puts into the citation of Mr. *Bl.* his words concerning the Sacraments, a whole line against the sence of the Author, pag. 25.

8. He corrupts the evident meaning of Mr. *Bl.* his words by his interpretation, *ibid.*

9. He imposes upon Mr. *Bl.* that he sayes Sacraments, as outward works, exercise no causality, or efficiency against his expresse words and whole discourse, pag. 26.

10. He corrupts his intention of writing his grounds of Government, pag. 28.

11. He corrupts *St. Austin* by citing him in a wrong sence pag. 36.

12. He corrupts him again by a false and non-sensical interpretation, pag. 37.

13. He corrupts another Saint, by making him speak of Purgatory before the day of judgement, whereas he speaks of Judgement, *ibid.*

14. He corrupts Mr. *Bl.* his words of one pretended Vision, by applying them generally to all, that is, to true Visions also, pag. 39. and afterwards pag. 4.

What truths he will corrupt in his informations against me at Rome (which he seems to threaten, pag. 42.) where there will be no body to answer in my behalf, may be expected out of this scantling.

Tannts and Jeers, in his printed Answer.

1. What strange fancy, humour, or genius possessed him, pag. 20.

2. That Mr. *Bl.* his spirit is neither sober nor Christian-like, nor peaceable, pag. 33.

In the second part.

1. That Mr. *Bl.* his conscience *semper praesumit se vera*, p. 6.

D 3

2. That

2. That Mr. Bl. his understanding is distempered, and his conscience disorder'd, pag. 7.

3. That Mr. Bl. may rightly be stiled *coluber Britannicus*, or *Lubricus anguis*, pag. 8.

4. That Mr. Bl. gloriously affecteth *Thomas Albionum Trinobantum*, a bragging Captain, pag. 11.

It seems the good Doctor thinks that Trinobantum is the Genitive case of a participle from a Verb Trinobare, which should signifie to triumph, or brag, or some such thing, agreeing with the substantive Albionum; both by his expression of bragging, and by the wrong Grammar he makes, which he finds not in Mr. Bl. his book; and by his often pleasing himself with this fear.

5. The Doctor fillily clabs (as he calls it) Mr. Bl. his opinions into Heresies, pag. 14.

6. The Doctor condemneth Mr. Bl. of open blasphemy, pag. 21.

7. That Mr. Bl. adds the Serpent that hissed poyson into Eve in Paradise, pag. 33.

8. That Mr. Bl. is blown up with the dreams of his own troubled fancy, *ibid.*

9. He calls Mr. Bl. his Doctrine impious and blasphemous, pag. 35.

10. That Mr. Bl. hissereth poysonous words, pag. 35.

11. He stiles him *our all knowing Thomas Albionum Trinobantum*, and falsly adds that he stiles himself *Thomas Albionum Trinobantum* in his printed books, pag. 36.

12. He sayes Mr. Bl. commits a sin against the Holy Ghost, and *flagitium profanatis*, pag. 37. and 38.

13. He sayes Mr. Bl. his opinion is branded by St. Austin with impudency, pag. 40.

14. He sayes Mr. Bl. is civil to the Devils and the damned, pag. 5. of his Letter to two.

15. To these may be added his calling every opinion he dislikes a prophane novelty.

16. Also his witty Epiphonemas, whereof let his Grammarians look whether the rest be Latin, excepting that which he took out of the Apostle, which signifies onely *supermoderatè*. But

But perhaps his Partial, who make no distinction between the same language, by one justly concluded and necessarily pronounced, and by another calumniating and speaking, upon slight grounds, at random, will think him not blameable, at least not more than I am, for this extravagant language in his Reply; because I occasion'd it by my sharpnesse in my answer, as they conceit. Let us see then whether his first Letter against me when I medled not with him, and which began all this stir, be more moderate than his Reply: That the spirit of the man, as yet untouched, may be discerned, and whether I was not forced to discover it whom it concerned; and still leave him inexcusable for beginning first without cause given to write to his brethren against me in such an insolent and calumniating manner. I present them therefore, out of his first Letter (which I have under his own hand, and which himself owns in his second part, pag. 4.) with these

His first Provocations and an-occasion'd Reproaches.

1. That Mr. B^r. teacheth Diabolical Doctrine.
2. That he is not from God.
3. That he hath made the Clergy odious to all Christian Princes.
4. That he is void of common sense, reason and Religion in delivering his Rules of obedience.
5. That he is excommunicated.
6. That he sleights Decrees from Rome.
7. That his books are condemned.
8. That he is an unworthy Member of the Society he is of, and that it is high time to discard him,
9. That by the judgement of a man of great esteem and Authority, he would be the cause the pension would be taken from the Doctor's Colledge, which two judgements by likelihood, sprung from the Doctors own information.
10. That in the same mans judgement the chief heads and Members of the Clergy, if not all, were Schismatical.

All these (some of which are the highest provocations which can be given to a Christian, who hath any care of his good name) are pure fictions of his own brain without any other ground more than his own falsifications, and his own bare word, as hath been shown; yet sent by him to be published to the whole Clergy as concerning them all. Let now any indifferent man judge, whether I was not forced

and in my answer to speak the truth of his wrong in plain words. I omit another passage in the same Letter against me, which manifestly aimed at blood, if it had had any ground to work the effect. It were not amiss to subjoin some of his.

His seditious, imprudent, and malicious carriages in this Pamphlet.

1. His vilifying the Consult at London by expressing them by unworthy and contemptible terms. To omit his calumny against them in this, and his framing and spreading a report against them in his former Letter that they are Schismatical.

2. His denying and disgracing the Sub-dean-ship; which two acts of his utterly break asunder all that little Union they have amongst them, which was sound and entire, till upon his Letters and informations some of his began to dissolve it.

3. His bringing to light unnecessarily businesses concerning the Government of the Chapter.

4. Naming the names of the chiefest Members of the Clergy about London.

5. His expresse plotting of division betwixt his brethren in the Country & these in London, pag. 3. of his Epistle to two.

6. His sending his Pamphlet to Lay-men whom it concern'd, not by expresse order of his Letters hither, and that, to increase division; by which means it is gotten into the hands of Protestants; and a Gentleman now in London affirms that he heard of the business first from a Protestant, who had seen Dr. Leyburn his Pamphlet.

I might add another head (were it not too tedious) of his self-praises and professions of his own sanctity, integrity, patience, zeal, and other virtues; applying the sayings of Saints (importing Heroical acts of virtue, meekness, charity, and humility) to himself; which though they seem fine flowers of piety, yet wanting the sap of Truth in his dealings, and being blasted with so many falsifications, open calumnies, and other injurious, and insolent carriages, quickly fade into Hypocrisy. And are only sufficient to take weak men and Fools, not wise and prudent persons, who will consider what he *does, shows, and proves*, not what he *talks, pretends and professes*.

Mr. BL. concluded that either this Letter of his, was sufficient to shew the Dr. had neither learning enough to censure, nor conscience in slandering any that he conceived stood in his way; nor truth in his hypocritical expostitions; nor prudence or charity in his actions; or that nothing would do it. If it was sufficient, he had done his business; which was that under opinion of learning and piety the Dr. would not be able to make a schism and division in the Clergy. If nothing were sufficient, that he had a *Superseas* from further pains, and therefore was resolved to lose no more time upon him, but to sit down quietly as he had done so many years, how bold & shameless soever he proves in calumniating.

Whereas Dr. Layb. in his Letters hither, hath expressly ordered that his Pamphlet against Mr. BL. may be communicated to the Laity, & the end they may know who he is; Mr. BL. on the other side, requests those of the Clergy, who shall come to have this Reply of his, not to communicate it to the Laity, except those whom it may much concern, to the end they may not know Dr. Layb. and thence conceive a prejudice against his house.

F I N I S.